



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

ON EARTH PEACE. . . . NATION SHALL NOT LIFT UP SWORD AGAINST NATION, NEITHER SHALL THEY LEARN WAR ANY MORE.

NEW SERIES.

BOSTON, SEPTEMBER, 1869.

No. 9.

## SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR.

War will of course continue until something better is found to take its place. Every one who will examine the subject with any tolerable degree of care and candor, must see that expedients might be devised far better than the sword for all purposes of either justice or safety. We propose such substitutes — *Negotiation, Mediation, Arbitration, a Congress of Nations.*

Here, then, are four substitutes for war, each simple, easy and effective; substitutes which every man of the least sense or candor must admit to be infinitely better than an appeal to the savage argument of lead and steel; substitutes which recognize right instead of might, reason in place of brute force, as the arbiter of national disputes; substitutes which nations could, if they would, adopt in part, without delay, and ere long the whole of them; substitutes which would at once supersede every plea of necessity for war, insure far more justice in the intercourse of nations, and guaranty in due time their permanent peace and prosperity.

Now, we insist on the duty of nations to adopt such substitutes as these. If they are moral agents like individuals, they are equally bound to an amicable, bloodless adjustment of their difficulties; and, if war is held by none to be justifiable except as a last resort, and should never be employed till after all other expedients have failed, then must nations, on the lowest principles of peace or common sense, abstain from the sword until they have not only tried in good faith negotiation, reference and mediation, but established a congress of nations, and submitted their disputes to its high and impartial arbitrament. All this they *can* do, if they *will*; and, until they do so, how can war be called their *last* resort?

‘But nations have no common judge, and hence they *must* decide each its own case.’ True, they have *at present* no such judge; but they *might* have, if they *would*; and we call upon them by every motive of reason, duty and self-interest, to establish one as soon as possible.

‘Meanwhile, however, what shall settle their disputes?’ Surely not the sword, but some one of the substitutes we propose. War settles disputes! Never; the parties invariably sheath the sword before they dream of a settlement, and then dispatch, not men of blood to fight, but men of peace, plenipotentiaries, to negotiate. Now, why not do this *before* fighting, and thus obviate all necessity of war?

‘True, if the parties were willing; but can you make them willing before they have fought awhile?’ — Yes, we could, if we would; but how little effort is made for peace in comparison with what *must* be for war? No two nations could *begin* a war in earnest without sacrificing, in one way and another, scores of millions; but a tenth or even a hundredth part as much, if wisely spent in the use of moral means for the purpose, would form such a public sentiment, that no power on earth could goad the parties into conflict. — Unwilling for a peaceful adjustment! who is unwilling? Am I? Are you? We resent the charge; and, should you go among any people through both countries, you would find scarce a man that would not profess to be equally anxious for a bloodless issue of the dispute.

‘Perhaps the *people* are willing; but the *rulers* are not.’ Rulers not willing! Why not? Because the *people* do not call *loud* enough for a peaceful settlement. Rulers will generally go either for peace or for war, just as the people go; they *can*, if they will, settle their disputes without war, quite as well as individuals can theirs without duels; they *will* do so, whenever the people shall come every where to demand it aright; the people *will thus demand it*, whenever they shall be duly enlightened on the subject; and hence do we urge the pulpit and the press, every sect in religion, and every party in politics, all Christians, philanthropists and patriots, to unite in filling every community with such an abhorrence of war, and such strong desires for peace, as shall hereafter constrain rulers to employ pacific expedients alone for the settlement of all national disputes.

ARBITRATION.—Our government has been foremost in adopting this expedient for the settlement of international disputes. For such an adjustment of claims by some of our citizens against the government of Venezuela, a commission had been agreed upon, and its awards actually made, when the minister of Venezuela sought to set them aside for sundry reasons; but Mr. Seward, as one of the last acts of his long secretaryship, put his veto upon them thus: —

‘International tribunals for the adjudication of private claims are created by governments in no expectation that they are to escape that possible admixture of error which is inseparable from all human institutions. They are resorted to because the governments concerned have either actually

experienced, or have been forced to anticipate, the impracticability of their coming to an agreement upon the merits of such claims, and upon the methods of investigating them. However imperfect the expedient may prove, it is adopted in view of the dread alternative in comparison with which a partial failure to accomplish exact justice falls into insignificance. First among the great powers to introduce this beneficent mode of achieving the peaceful termination of international controversies, it is not for the United States to do or suffer aught that can impair its efficacy. The deliberations and judgment of a commission would be fruitless, if they only started questions for renewed discussion. They must be final, or they must be nothing. We are compelled, therefore, to decline any examination of the correctness of the decisions upon the merits of the several cases decided by the Caracas commission, whether arrived at by the concurrence of the commissioners, or by the award of the umpire, himself a citizen of Venezuela, to whom the convention in case of their disagreement committed the final adjudication of the case."

To this the Venezuela minister assents:—"Venezuela has not only applauded the efforts of the United States to implant it in the law of nations, but herself commends it in her fundamental law, and Venezuela, not being herself a maritime and military power, which might rely upon its ability to seize at all events by force what it might not obtain by the power of reason, less still than the United States would she incline to anything that might bring into discredit the efficiency of arbitration."

**PROGRESS OF DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.**—By democracy we mean the principle that government is designed, and should be made to promote and insure the general welfare of the people irrespective of the few who claim an inheritary right to rule, and to monopolize the honors and emoluments of government. Democracy, in this broad and only just sense, is making sure and steady progress in nearly all parts of Europe, but in a way generally so quiet and so much in accordance with law and order, as to excite comparatively little fear of violent revolution.

We might quote many facts in point, but will now allude only to the late election in France. When Louis Napoleon, seventeen years ago, "seized the reins of power, and submitted his claim to the popular voice, he was elected Emperor of France by an almost unanimous vote. Since that time, the opposition to his throne has displayed itself more strongly at every successive election, counted at first by thousands and then by millions, until last month it numbered nearly half the votes cast in the election. In 1863 about 5,300,000 electors voted for the official candidates and 1,800,000 against them. But this year we have 4,000,000 electors true to the imperial candidates and 3,200,000 against them, leaving only a majority of 800,000 in all France in favor of the existing government. Still more significant is the result in Paris itself. In 1863 the government had 83,000 votes and the opposition 149,000; this year the government has but 55,000 and the opposition 210,000. In other words the capital itself, which more than all the cities of the empire might be expected to be dazzled by the splendors and bribed by the advantages of imperialism, goes boldly, by a majority of almost four-fifths, in favor of the liberal and even in many districts the ultra-democratic candidates."

**MILITARY COST OF COLONIES.**—It would seem that England—still worse, we believe, with France—pays dear for the colonies she has scattered around the globe. We have before us eleven votes on the subject, "which together amount to £3,388,023 (about \$18,000,000), or nearly one-fifth of her entire army estimates. What has she to show for all this that she might not have if such of the colonies as are virtually independent, or fit for independence, were self-sustaining and self-defending?" It is, moreover, her foreign possessions that involve her in most of her wars.

**OUR DEBT COMPARED WITH OTHER NATIONS.**—Before the late rebellion we had next to no national debt or tax; but it would seem that no people in the world are so heavily taxed as ours. Here is the view of intelligent foreigners on this point:—

The funded debt of the United States (reduced to English money at the ordinary rate of 4s. 2d. to the dollar) amounts to £575,000,000, and the legal tender notes, or unfunded debt, to about of £142,000,000. The greater part of this will probably be funded sooner or later, making the ultimate total reach to £700,000,000. This, too, is the debt incurred by the Federal Government alone, and takes no account either of the vast sums borrowed by the Confederate Government, or of the separate smaller debts of the different states. Altogether America, which before the war was the most lightly burdened of all the great nations of the world, is now the most heavily burdened. The following comparison, taken from the official statements, will show how the real burden of debt is apportioned:—

	Cap'l Debt in Mills.	Int. on Debt in Mills.	Int. per Head of the Pop.
United States	£575	£28.75	19s. 0d.
Great Britain	800	26.00	17s. 8d.
Holland	85	2.47	14s. 10d.
France	462	17.85	9s. 6d.
Italy	152	7.90	7s. 3d.
Austria	224	11.60	6s. 8d.
Russia	142	9.05	2s. 7d.
Prussia	36	2.23	2s. 5d.

—*Pall Mall Gazette, (Eng.)*

**SAFETY OF PACIFIC PRINCIPLES.**—Some years ago, a frightful and bloody war was raging between the Indians and the settlers in the backwoods of North America. Houses were burned, farms laid waste, men, women, and children slaughtered. The surviving inhabitants had all fled for their lives, except one pious and prayerful Quaker with his family. He felt that he was in the place where God had put him, and where duty called him to remain. He would therefore neither fight nor fly, but stay where he was, trusting in God. One morning he saw a file of savages issuing from the forest yelling out their war-cry, and making straight for his house. Lifting up his heart to God in prayer, he went to meet them, and held out his hand to the leader of the band. The chief and his warriors passed by the lonely settler without seeming to notice him. They entered his house and searched it for arms; but they found none. Had they done so, they would probably have murdered every member of the family. The good man, still, silently calling upon God to deliver him, now set provisions before them, and supplied, as far as he could, all their wants. They ate the food he gave them and withdrew to a short distance from the house, where they re-